

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 HADARI A. STALLWORTH,

Case No. 3:17-cv-00667-MMD-WGC

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 v.

12 JAMES DZURENDA, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

14 This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by  
15 a state prisoner. On December 15, 2017, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to  
16 file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee of  
17 \$400.00 within thirty (30) days from the date of that order. (ECF No. 3 at 2). The thirty-  
18 day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an application to proceed *in forma*  
19 *pauperis*, paid the full filing fee, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

20 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
21 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
22 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
23 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure  
24 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
25 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance  
26 with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for  
27 failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856  
28 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring

1       pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833  
2 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson*  
3 v. *Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and  
4 failure to comply with local rules).

5           In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
6 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
7 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
8 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
9 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
10 *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;  
11 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

12          In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
13 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
14 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
15 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
16 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See  
17 *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy  
18 favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor  
19 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
20 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
21 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
22 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an application to proceed *in forma*  
23 *pauperis* or pay the full filing fee within thirty (30) days expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER  
24 ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not timely comply with this order, dismissal of this action  
25 may result." (ECF No. 3 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would  
26 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file an application to proceed *in*  
27 *forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee within thirty (30) days.

28       ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
2 Plaintiff's failure to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee  
3 in compliance with this Court's December 15, 2017, order.

4 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court enter judgment accordingly.

DATED THIS 24<sup>th</sup> day of January 2018.



MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE